

**REMARKS**

No new claims have been added. Claims 1-16 remain pending. No fees are believed to be due. If this is incorrect, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter not described in the specification as to enable one skilled in the art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that “the terminology ‘event-driven’ is acceptable” (Office Action, page 3, line 6) but states that “serial-execution code is still not taught” (Office Action, page 3, lines 6-7). Claims 1 and 8, as amended, recite “computer code” that is serially executed. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

For claim 7, the Office Action asserts, “it is not clear how changing an object to code equivalent to the object, and then changing the code back to an object equivalent to the code would result in a different program.” Office Action, page 3, lines 11-13. Claims 7 and 1, as amended, recite that the object and the computer code is represented by a first event driven program and a modified object and the computer code is represented by a second event driven program. Notably, claims 7 and 1 do not recite changing an object to code equivalent to the object and then changing the code back to an object equivalent to the code resulting in a different program. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action appears to be asserting that the term “serial-execution code” has been given a meaning “repugnant to their definitions.” Office Action, page 3, line 20. Claims 1 and 8, as amended, do not recite the term “serial-execution code.”

The Office Action appears to further assert that the term “program” is unclear. The term “program” is a known term of the art. Therefore, Applicants are confused as to what precisely is unclear about the term “program.” If the Office Action continues to maintain the position that the term “program” is unclear in this context, Applicants request further clarification as to the specific reason(s).

The Office Action also asserts that the term “represented” is unclear as it relates to “code” and “program”. Applicants submit that the term “represented” is a known term. The Office Action fails to provide a rationale or reasons why the term “represented” is considered to be unclear. If the Office Action continues to maintain the position that the term “represented” is unclear in this context, Applicants request further clarification as to the specific reason(s).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,956,736) in view of Popp (U.S. Pat. No 6,651,108). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hanson and Popp, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claim 1 or claim 8, as amended. For example, neither Hanson nor Popp teach or suggest an event-driven program or inputting via an event-driven program. The Office Action asserts that “Hanson teaches

receiving input from a designer, ... which also can be event-driven (col. 8, ll. 10-17)." Office Action, page 6, lines 16-18. However, Hanson at col. 8, lines 10-17 discloses "handlers" that are pieces "of software code that (are) executed in response to a message or event." Although the word "event" appears at col. 8, line 14 of Hanson, Hanson nevertheless fails to teach or suggest displaying the visual representation of an object to the designer in an event-driven format or representing an object or computer code by a first event driven program. Clearly, a disclosure of a "handler" (i.e., software code) that executes in response to an "event" is insufficient to teach or suggest displaying a visual representation of an object to a designer in an event-driven format or representing an object by a first (or second) event driven program. Indeed, the basic underlying concepts are completely dissimilar.

Likewise, Popp fails to teach or suggest displaying a visual representation of an object to a designer in an event-driven format or representing an object by a first (or second) event driven program. Therefore, Hanson and Popp, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest claims 1 or 8. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 and 9-16 depend from claims 1 and/or 8. Therefore, claims 2-7 and 9-16 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful in facilitating prosecution of the case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
CR Christopher R. Glembocki  
Registration No. 38,800

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 824-3000

Dated: February 17, 2005